



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,104	07/31/2003	Douglas E. Berning	S-100,503	7758
35068	7590	03/24/2005	EXAMINER	
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY P.O. BOX 1663, MS A187 LOS ALAMOS, NM 87545			LE, HOA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/631,104	BERNING ET AL.
	Examiner H. T. Le	Art Unit 1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method of making gold coated magnetic nanoparticles, classified in class 427, subclass 217.
 - II. Claims 12-16, drawn to gold-coated magnetic nanoparticles, classified in class 428, subclass 403.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process such as ion-plating.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Applicants' Representative, Mr. Bruce Cottrell on March 17, 2005, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-11. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying

to this Office action. Claims 12-16 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

*h
03/05*
The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either (1) Zhou (“Nanostructures of gold coated iron core-shell nanoparticles and the nanobands assembled under magnetic field”) or (2) Cheon et al (US 6,783,569), each in view of Oldenburg (US 6,685,986).

Claim 1: Zhou and Cheon et al each disclose gold-coated magnetic nanoparticles. See Zhou, abstract and Cheon, col. 8, lines 64-68. Oldenburg et al teach a method of coating gold on a core, in particular silica core, comprising forming a suspension of silica particles in a liquid, forming a solution comprising a reducible gold compound and a reducing agent,

adding the gold solution in the silica suspension, and allowing time sufficient for the reducible gold compound forming a gold coating on the silica core. See Oldenburg, col. 10, lines 5-21; col. 11, lines 23-37; and col. 11, line 66 to col. 12, line 25. Thus, Oldenburg teaches a method similar to the claimed method except that the core is a silica instead of magnetic nanoparticles. Oldenburg also points out that the other coating methods suffer limitations in controlling or selecting the resulting dimensions of the core radius or the coating thickness. See Oldenburg, col. 2, lines 1-15. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to apply the coating method taught by Oldenburg in making the gold-coated magnetic nanoparticles taught by Zhou or Cheon because the Oldenburg method is superior to the other method in terms of controlling the dimensions of the resulting product.

Claims 2 and 3: See Cheon, col. 4, lines 14-48.

Claims 4 & 5: See Oldenburg, col. 12, lines 1-10.

Claims 6-10: At col. 7, lines 11-34, Oldenburg teaches using a linker molecule to facilitate surface coating of gold. Oldenburg suggests silane as the linker because the core is silica. However, one having ordinary skill in the art, based on this particular teaching of Oldenburg, would have found it obvious to select linker molecule that's correspondingly suitable for the core chosen.

Claim 11: See Cheon, col. 8, lines 56-62.

7. References not relied upon are cited as art of interest.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



H. T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773